

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 2, 2003. A Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

Claims 1-26 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-26. The present Response amends Claims 7, 18 and 20, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-26. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

### Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 7 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 7 and 18-21 were rejected as having insufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 1 through 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dynamic Access® Technology in view of *Davis, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160).

### Response to Rejections

The specification has been objected to due to a number of informalities. The informalities noticed by the Examiner have been amended in this application. Claims 7 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Second paragraph as having failed to set forth the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 7 has been amended to be dependent on claim 5. Claim 18 has been amended to be dependent on claim 17. Claim 20 has been amended to be dependent on claim 18.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dynamic Access® Technology, 3Com Technical Paper, hereinafter Dynamic Access in view of *Davis et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,937,160. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Dynamic Access Paper describes a

method for updating the configuration of a specification of a computer. Davis et al., describes a method for updating hypertext documents by electronic mail.

Claims 1-26 are believed to be allowable since they are believed to be no suggestion to combine the Davis et al, and Dynamic Access Technology references. The Davis et al, and Dynamic Access Technology refer to two different types of software. The Davis et al, system describes a system for updating a hypertext document such as a web pages using electronic mail. The Dynamic Access Technology reference describes a method for updating a specification of the computer. Since these references deal with two different types of software applications it would not be obvious to combine these references to produce the present claimed invention. One would not think to use a software method such as that of Davis et al., which deals with way of updating hypertext programs in combination with the system for configuring a specification of a computer. For this reason claims 1-26 are believed to be allowable as such is respectfully requested.

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon have been reviewed, but are not believed to render the claims unpatentable, either singly or in combination.


In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, June 18, 2003.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-18-03

By:   
Joseph P. O'Malley  
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800